arXiv:1408.0713v2 [math.NA] 22 Jun 2015

Weak error estimates of the exponential Euler scheme for semi-linear SPDEs without Malliavin calculus *

Xiaojie Wang †

School of Mathematics and Statistics, Central South University,

Changsha 410083, Hunan, PR China

June 23, 2015

Abstract

This paper deals with the weak error estimates of the exponential Euler method for semi-linear stochastic partial differential equations (SPDEs). A weak error representation formula is first derived for the exponential integrator scheme in the context of truncated SPDEs. The obtained formula that enjoys the absence of the irregular term involved with the unbounded operator is then applied to a parabolic SPDE. Under certain mild assumptions on the nonlinearity, we treat a full discretization based on the spectral Galerkin spatial approximation and provide an easy weak error analysis, which does not rely on Malliavin calculus.

AMS subject classification: 60H35, 60H15, 65C30.

Key Words: semi-linear stochastic partial differential equations, additive noise, exponential Euler scheme, weak convergence

1 Introduction

Given two separable Hilbert spaces $(H, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_H, \|\cdot\|_H)$ and $(U, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_U, \|\cdot\|_U)$, we consider the following Itô type stochastic evolution equation driven by additive noise,

$$\begin{cases} \mathrm{d}X(t) = AX(t)\,\mathrm{d}t + F(X(t))\,\mathrm{d}t + B\,\mathrm{d}W(t), \quad t \in (0,T], \\ X(0) = X_0 \in H, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

* This work was partially supported by NNSF of China (No.11301550, No.11171352, and No.11401594), Postdoctoral Foundation of China (No.2013M531798 and No.2014T70779). Part of this work was done when the author attended a seminar at AMSS, Beijing. The author would like to thank Prof.Jialin Hong, Dr.Tao Zhou and students of Jinlin for their kindness and help when he stayed in Beijing.

†Corresponding author: x.j.wang7@gmail.com, x.j.wang7@csu.edu.cn

where $T \in (0,\infty)$, $A : \mathcal{D}(A) \subset H \to H$ is the generator of a C_0-semigroup and $\{W(t)\}_{t\in[0,T]}$ is a cylindrical I_U-Wiener process on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with a normal filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\in[0,T]}$. Moreover, $F\colon H \to H$, $B\colon U \to H$ are deterministic mappings and the initial data $X_0 \in H$ is assumed to be deterministic. Under certain assumptions, a unique mild solution of (1.1) exists and is given by

$$X(t) = E(t)X_0 + \int_0^t E(t-s)F(X(s))\,\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t E(t-s)B\,\mathrm{d}W(s),\ \ a.s.\ \ \text{for}\ \ t \in [0,T], \qquad (1.2)$$

where $E(t) = e^{tA}$, $t \in [0,T]$ is a C_0-semigroup in H generated by A. Given a uniform mesh on $[0,T]$ with $\tau = \frac{T}{M}$, $M \in \mathbb{N}$ being the stepsize, the present work focusses on the weak approximations $\{Y_m\}_{m=0}^M$ of the mild solution (1.2). More formally, the aim of this paper is to measure the discrepancy between the quantity $\mathbb{E}[\Phi(X(T))]$ and its approximation $\mathbb{E}[\Phi(Y_M)]$, i.e., $\big|\mathbb{E}[\Phi(X(T))] - \mathbb{E}[\Phi(Y_M)]\big|$, for a smooth function $\Phi\colon H \to \mathbb{R}$. This topic has been extensively studied in recent years (see, e.g., [1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 14, 18, 25, 27] and the references therein). For a linear SPDE with additive noise, whose solution can be written down explicitly, the weak error of the implicit Euler method can be expressed by means of a Kolmogorov equation after removing the irregular term $AX(t)$ by a transformation of variables [13, 20, 21, 23]. In this case, it becomes easy to treat the weak error estimates. This approach, however, does not work for the nonlinear heat equation and the corresponding weak error analysis of the implicit Euler method is much more technical and complicated [12, 29]. In particular, an integration by parts formula from the Malliavin calculus was exploited to handle the irregular term and the term involving the nonlinear operator F. If the dominant linear operator A generates a group, more than a semigroup, a transformed Kolmogorov equation can be used to simplify the weak error estimates of numerical schemes for nonlinear problems [11, 27]. This idea was firstly introduced and exploited in [11] to deal with the weak error analysis for the temporal semi-discretization of the nonlinear stochastic Schrödinger equation. It is also worthwhile to mention [8] and [18], where the spectral Galerkin approximation and Euler-type time-stepping schemes are considered for semi-linear stochastic evolution equations with multiplicative noise and a weak error analysis free from Malliavin calculus is performed by using a mild Itô type formula.

In this work we look at the temporal discretization of (1.1) by the exponential Euler scheme,

$$Y_{m+1} = E(\tau)Y_m + \tau E(\tau)F(Y_m) + E(\tau)B\Delta W_m, \quad Y_0 = X_0, \quad m = 0,1,2,...,M-1, \quad (1.3)$$

where $E(\tau)B\Delta W_m := \int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} E(\tau)B\,\mathrm{d}W(s)$ is well-defined when $E(\tau)B\colon U \to H$ is a Hilbert-Schmidt operator. It is known that exponential integrators are successfully used to solve deterministic stiff and highly oscillatory problems (see the recent review [15] and references therein). The extension to stochastic cases can be found in [3, 6, 7, 16, 17, 19, 24, 27]. Particularly, the exponential integrator for the stochastic wave equation (SWE) can achieve higher strong and weak convergence order than the usual implicit Euler and Crank-Nicolson schemes [6, 27]. An interesting finding here is that the weak error analysis of the exponential Euler temporal discretization (1.3) for the nonlinear stochastic heat equation can be carried

out in a very simple way. To see this, we first derive a weak error representation formula for the scheme (1.3) applied to truncated SPDEs emerged from spatial discretizations such as the finite element method and the spectral Galerkin method. The formula is free from the irregular term involved with the unbounded linear operator. Then we utilize the obtained formula to analyze the weak approximation error of the exponential Euler scheme for parabolic SPDEs driven by additive noise. Based on the spectral Galerkin spatial discretization, the weak error of a full discretization is also examined. We emphasize that the idea of transformed Kolmogorov equation is adapted to derive the error formula in the parabolic setting. Further weak error estimates for the time discretization rely heavily on appropriate assumptions we formulate on the nonlinear operator F (see Assumption 3.1), which not only allow F to be a Nemytskij operator in d space dimensions for $d = 1, 2, 3$ (see Example 3.2), but also facilitate the error analysis. In the analysis a linearization of the nonlinearity F is additionally performed and this is an important ingredient (see (3.35)). Note that the idea of linearization was previously exploited in [1, 22, 27] to handle the weak error. This way we provide a weak error analysis which does not rely on sophisticated theory such as Malliavin calculus but relies on elementary arguments. Our method of proof substantially simplifies the weak error analysis, compared to the standard analysis in [12, 29]. Nevertheless, it remains an open problem whether such easy analysis can work for other schemes such as the implicit Euler scheme. This will be the subject of our future work.

Following the idea of Section 2, one can easily extend the weak error representation formula to the multiplicative noise case. Further weak error estimates as in Section 3, however, become a difficult problem due to the presence of estimates involving diffusion terms (see [12]). For a particular space-time white noise case when the space dimension $d = 1$ and the diffusion operator $G(u)\colon U \to U$, $u \in U$ is a linear Nemytskij operator given by $\big(G(u)v\big)(\xi) = c \cdot u(\xi) \cdot v(\xi)$, $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $\xi \in (0, 1)$, one can exploit the similar techniques as used in Section 3 to estimate the diffusion term appearing in the error representation formula. To highlight the key idea and for simplicity of presentation, only the additive noise case is considered here. Although strong and pathwise convergence of exponential integrators for parabolic SPDEs exist in the literature [19, 24], the corresponding weak convergence result is missing, which also partly motivates this work. Finally, we point out that, the error representation formula is also applicable to exponential integrators for other types of SPDEs, such as the stochastic wave equation. Since the weak convergence rate of the exponential integrator scheme for the SWE has been studied in [27], we do not intend to recover the known result in this paper.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In the next section, some preliminaries are collected and a weak error representation formula is elaborated. In Section 3, the obtained error formula is applied to SPDE of parabolic type and the weak convergence rate of the exponential Euler scheme is obtained.

2 An error representation formula for truncated SPDEs

Let $(H, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_H, \|\cdot\|_H)$ and $(U, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_U, \|\cdot\|_U)$ be two separable Hilbert spaces. By $\mathcal{C}_b^k(U,H)$ we denote the space of not necessarily bounded mappings from U to H that have continuous and bounded Fréchet derivatives up to order k, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, by $\mathcal{L}(U,H)$ we denote the space of bounded linear operators from U to H endowed with the usual operator norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}(U,H)}$ and write $\mathcal{L}(U) := \mathcal{L}(U,U)$ for simplicity. Additionally, we need spaces of nuclear operators from U to H, denoted by $\mathcal{L}_1(U,H)$ and spaces of Hilbert-Schmidt operators from U to H by $\mathcal{L}_2(U,H)$. As usual, $\mathcal{L}_1(U,H)$ and $\mathcal{L}_2(U,H)$ are endowed with the nuclear norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_1(U,H)}$ [10, Appendix C] and the Hilbert-Schmidt norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(U,H)}$ [10, Appendix C], respectively. To lighten the notation, we also write $\mathcal{L}_1(U) := \mathcal{L}_1(U,U)$ and $\mathcal{L}_2(U) := \mathcal{L}_2(U,U)$. For $\Gamma \in \mathcal{L}_1(U)$, the trace of Γ, defined by $\mathrm{Tr}(\Gamma) := \sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\langle \Gamma\psi_i, \psi_i\rangle_U$, is independent of the particular choice of the basis $\{\psi_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ of U and satisfies $|\mathrm{Tr}(\Gamma)| \le \|\Gamma\|_{\mathcal{L}_1(U)}$. If $\Gamma_1 \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ and $\Gamma_2 \in \mathcal{L}_1(H)$, then both $\Gamma_1\Gamma_2$ and $\Gamma_2\Gamma_1$ belong to $\mathcal{L}_1(H)$ and

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\Gamma_1\Gamma_2) = \mathrm{Tr}(\Gamma_2\Gamma_1). \tag{2.1}$$

If $\Gamma_1 \in \mathcal{L}_2(U,H), \Gamma_2 \in \mathcal{L}_2(H,U)$, then $\Gamma_1\Gamma_2 \in \mathcal{L}_1(H)$ and $\|\Gamma_1\Gamma_2\|_{\mathcal{L}_1(H)} \le \|\Gamma_1\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(U,H)}\|\Gamma_1\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H,U)}$. For $\Gamma \in \mathcal{L}_2(U,H)$, it holds that the adjoint operator $\Gamma^* \in \mathcal{L}_2(H,U)$ and $\|\Gamma^*\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H,U)} = \|\Gamma\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(U,H)}$. Moreover, if $\Gamma \in \mathcal{L}(U,H)$ and $\Gamma_j \in \mathcal{L}_j(U)$, $j = 1,2$, then $\Gamma\Gamma_j \in \mathcal{L}_j(U,H)$ and $\|\Gamma\Gamma_j\|_{\mathcal{L}_j(U,H)} \le \|\Gamma\|_{\mathcal{L}(U,H)} \cdot \|\Gamma_j\|_{\mathcal{L}_j(U)}$, $j = 1,2$.

Next, we make the following assumptions.

Assumption 2.1 *Assume the linear subspace H_n of H for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is a finite dimensional Hilbert space, endowed with the inner product induced by restriction. Let $A_n\colon H_n \to H_n$ be a linear bounded operator in H_n, which generates a strongly continuous semigroup $E_n(t) = e^{tA_n}$, $t \in [0,\infty)$ in H_n. Moreover, assume the operator $E_n(-t) = e^{-tA_n}$ is well-defined in H_n and the inverse of $E_n(t)$, $t \in [0,\infty)$ in H_n, exists such that $\big(E_n(t)\big)^{-1} = E_n(-t)$. In addition, assume $X_0^n \in H_n$, $F_n \in \mathcal{C}_b^2(H_n,H_n)$ and $B_n \in \mathcal{L}_2(U,H_n)$.*

Then we consider a truncated problem, which arises due to spatial discretization of (1.1) and for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it takes the following form:

$$\begin{cases} \mathrm{d}X^n(t) = A_nX^n(t)\mathrm{d}t + F_n(X^n(t))\mathrm{d}t + B_n\,\mathrm{d}W(t), \quad t \in (0,T], \\ X^n(0) = X_0^n \in H_n. \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

Here $A_n\colon H_n \subset H \to H_n$ is the discrete version of A in H_n and $F_n\colon H_n \to H_n$, $B_n\colon U \to H_n$ are corresponding approximation mappings.

The above framework is general in two respects. On the one hand, it can include many types of semi-linear SPDEs driven by additive noise, such as the stochastic heat equation and the stochastic wave equation. On the other hand, various spatial discretizations such as the finite element method and the spectral Galerkin method can be covered. Also, we emphasize that the constants used to measure the boundedness of the operators A_n, F_n, B_n might depend on n. As a result, the condition $F_n \in \mathcal{C}_b^2(H_n,H_n)$ does not imply $F \in \mathcal{C}_b^2(H,H)$.

Under Assumptions 2.1, Theorem 7.4 in [10] guarantees that the truncated problem (2.2) has a unique mild solution given by

$$X^n(t) = E_n(t)X_0^n + \int_0^t E_n(t-s)F_n(X^n(s))\,\mathrm{d}s + \int_0^t E_n(t-s)B_n\,\mathrm{d}W(s),\ \ a.s. \tag{2.3}$$

for $t \in [0,T]$. The exponential Euler scheme (1.3) applied to (2.2) yields

$$Y_{m+1}^n = E_n(\tau)\big(Y_m^n + \tau F_n(Y_m^n) + B_n\Delta W_m\big),\ \ Y_0^n = X_0^n,\ \ m = 0,1,\dots,M-1, \tag{2.4}$$

where $E_n(\tau)B_n\Delta W_m := \int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} E_n(\tau)B_n\,\mathrm{d}W(s)$ as before. In order to carry out the weak error analysis of the approximations (2.4), for $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}_b^2(H;\mathbb{R})$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we define the process $\mu^n\colon [0,T]\times H_n \to \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\mu^n(t,x) = \mathbb{E}[\Phi(X^n(t,x))]\,, \quad t \in [0,T], \quad x \in H_n, \tag{2.5}$$

where $X^n(t,x)$ is defined by (2.3) with the initial value $X_0^n = x \in H_n$. Recall that $\mu^n(t,x)$ defined by (2.5) is continuously differentiable with respect to t and continuously twice differentiable with respect to x, and serves as the unique strict solution of the following Kolmogorov's equation [10, Theorem 9.16]:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \mu^n}{\partial t}(t,x) = \big\langle A_n x + F_n(x), D\mu^n(t,x)\big\rangle_H + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\big[D^2\mu^n(t,x)B_n(B_n)^*\big], \\ \mu^n(0,x) = \Phi(x), \quad x \in H_n. \end{cases} \tag{2.6}$$

Here by a strict solution of the problem (2.6) we mean a function $\mu^n \in \mathcal{C}_b^{1,2}([0,T]\times H_n,\mathbb{R})$ fulfilling (2.6) (see [10, subsection 9.3.1]). Moreover, we always identify the first derivative $D\mu^n(t,x)$ at $x \in H_n$ with an element in H_n and the second derivative $D^2\mu^n(t,x)$ with a linear bounded operator in H_n by the Riesz representation theorem. With the above preliminaries at our disposal, we can prove the following weak error representation formula.

Theorem 2.2 (Weak error representation) *Assume all conditions in Assumption 2.1 are fulfilled and let $\{W(t)\}_{t\in[0,T]}$ be a cylindrical I_U-Wiener process. Then for $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}_b^2(H;\mathbb{R})$ the weak error of the scheme (2.4) for the problem (2.2) has the representation*

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\big[\Phi(Y_M^n)\big] - \mathbb{E}[\Phi(X^n(T))] \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^{M-1}\bigg\{\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big\langle D\mu^n(T-t,\tilde{Y}^n(t)), E_n(t-t_m)F_n(Y_m^n) - F_n\big(\tilde{Y}^n(t)\big)\Big\rangle_H\Big]\,dt \\ &\quad + \tfrac{1}{2}\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \mathbb{E}\Big[Tr\Big\{D^2\mu^n(T-t,\tilde{Y}^n(t))\Big(E_n(t-t_m)B_n\big(E_n(t-t_m)B_n\big)^* - B_n(B_n)^*\Big)\Big\}\Big]\,dt\bigg\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

Here $X^n(T)$ and Y_m^n are determined by (2.3) and (2.4), respectively, and $\tilde{Y}^n(t)$ is a continuous extension of Y_m^n, defined by

$$\tilde{Y}^n(t) = E_n(t-t_m)\big[Y_m^n + F_n(Y_m^n)(t-t_m) + B_n(W(t)-W(t_m))\big], \quad t \in [t_m,t_{m+1}], \tag{2.8}$$

where as before $E_n(t-t_m)B_n(W(t)-W(t_m)) := \int_{t_m}^t E(t-t_m)B_n\,dW(s)$.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. First, we introduce a function $\nu^n\colon [0,T]\times H_n\to\mathbb{R}$, given by

$$\nu^n(t,y)=\mu^n\big(t,E_n(-t)y\big), \tag{2.9}$$

which is obviously twice differentiable with respect to y and satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} D\nu^n(t,y)z =& D\mu^n(t,E_n(-t)y)E_n(-t)z, \quad y,z\in H_n, &(2.10)\\ D^2\nu^n(t,y)(z_1,z_2) =& D^2\mu^n(t,E_n(-t)y)(E_n(-t)z_1,E_n(-t)z_2), \quad y,z_1,z_2\in H_n. &(2.11)\end{aligned}$$

This together with (2.1) and the fact that $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\big(E_n(-t)y\big)=-A_nE_n(-t)y$ for $y\in H_n$ helps us to deduce from (2.6) that $\nu^n(t,y)$ is a strict solution of the following problem,

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial\nu^n}{\partial t}(t,y)=\big\langle E_n(t)F_n(E_n(-t)y),D\nu^n(t,y)\big\rangle_H+\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\big[D^2\nu^n(t,y)E_n(t)B_n\big(E_n(t)B_n\big)^*\big],\\ \nu^n(0,y)=\Phi(y), \quad y\in H_n. \end{cases} \tag{2.12}$$

Further, we introduce an auxiliary process $\tilde{Z}^n(t)=E_n(T-t)\tilde{Y}^n(t)$ defined by

$$\tilde{Z}^n(t)=E_n(T-t_m)Y_m^n+\int_{t_m}^t E_n(T-t_m)F_n(Y_m^n)\,\mathrm{d}s+\int_{t_m}^t E_n(T-t_m)B_n\,\mathrm{d}W(s) \tag{2.13}$$

for $t\in[t_m,t_{m+1}]$, $m=0,1,...,M-1$. The definition of $\tilde{Z}^n(t)$ allows for

$$\tilde{Z}^n(T)=\tilde{Y}^n(T)=Y_M^n \quad \text{ and } \quad \tilde{Z}^n(0)=E_n(T)X_0^n. \tag{2.14}$$

Therefore, we have the following decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}\big[\Phi(Y_M^n)\big]-\mathbb{E}\big[\Phi\big(X^n(T)\big)\big]=\mathbb{E}\big[\Phi(\tilde{Z}^n(T))\big]-\mu^n(T,X_0^n)\\ =&\mathbb{E}\big[\nu^n(0,\tilde{Z}^n(T))\big]-\nu^n(T,E_n(T)X_0^n)=\mathbb{E}\big[\nu^n(0,\tilde{Z}^n(T))\big]-\mathbb{E}\big[\nu^n(T,\tilde{Z}^n(0))\big]\\ =&\sum_{m=0}^{M-1}\Big(\mathbb{E}\big[\nu^n(T-t_{m+1},\tilde{Z}^n(t_{m+1}))\big]-\mathbb{E}\big[\nu^n(T-t_m,\tilde{Z}^n(t_m))\big]\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

Applying Itô's formula to $\nu^n(T-t,\tilde{Z}^n(t))$ for $t\in[t_m,t_{m+1}]$ and taking (2.1), (2.10), (2.11),

(2.12) into consideration show that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\big[\nu^n(T-t_{m+1},\tilde{Z}^n(t_{m+1}))\big]-\mathbb{E}\big[\nu^n(T-t_m,\tilde{Z}^n(t_m))\big]\\
=&-\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}}\mathbb{E}\Big[\tfrac{\partial\nu^n}{\partial t}(T-t,\tilde{Z}^n(t))\Big]\,\mathrm{d}t+\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}}\mathbb{E}\Big[D\nu^n(T-t,\tilde{Z}^n(t))E_n(T-t_m)F_n(Y_m^n)\Big]\,\mathrm{d}t\\
&+\tfrac{1}{2}\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}}\mathbb{E}\Big[\mathrm{Tr}\Big\{D^2\nu^n(T-t,\tilde{Z}^n(t))E_n(T-t_m)B_n\big(E_n(T-t_m)B_n\big)^*\Big\}\Big]\mathrm{d}t\\
=&\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}}\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big\langle D\nu^n(T-t,\tilde{Z}^n(t)),E_n(T-t_m)F_n(Y_m^n)-E_n(T-t)F_n(E_n(t-T)\tilde{Z}^n(t))\Big\rangle_H\Big]\,\mathrm{d}t\\
&+\tfrac{1}{2}\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}}\mathbb{E}\Big[\mathrm{Tr}\Big\{D^2\nu^n(T-t,\tilde{Z}^n(t))\Big(E_n(T-t_m)B_n\big(E_n(T-t_m)B_n\big)^*\\
&\qquad\qquad-E_n(T-t)B_n\big(E_n(T-t)B_n\big)^*\Big)\Big\}\Big]\mathrm{d}t\\
=&\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}}\mathbb{E}\Big[\Big\langle D\mu^n(T-t,\tilde{Y}^n(t)),E_n(t-t_m)F_n(Y_m^n)-F_n\big(\tilde{Y}^n(t)\big)\Big\rangle_H\Big]\,\mathrm{d}t\\
&+\tfrac{1}{2}\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}}\mathbb{E}\Big[\mathrm{Tr}\Big\{D^2\mu^n(T-t,\tilde{Y}^n(t))\Big(E_n(t-t_m)B_n\big(E_n(t-t_m)B_n\big)^*-B_n(B_n)^*\Big)\Big\}\Big]\mathrm{d}t,
\end{aligned}
$$

where we also used the fact that $\tilde{Y}^n(t)=E_n(t-T)\tilde{Z}^n(t)$. Plugging the above equality into (2.15) completes the proof. □

3 Weak convergence rates for parabolic SPDE

In this section, the weak error formula obtained above will be applied to a parabolic SPDE. To this end, we let $U=H$ be a separable Hilbert space, equipped with the norm $\|\cdot\|$ and scalar product $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$, and let Q be a bounded, linear, self-adjoint, positive semi-definite operator in H, which admits a unique positive square root $Q^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Let $B=Q^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and let $A\colon\mathcal{D}(A)\subset H\to H$ be a densely defined, linear unbounded, negative self-adjoint operator with compact inverse (e.g., the Laplace operator with homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions). Therefore (1.1) reduces to

$$
\begin{cases}\mathrm{d}X(t)=AX(t)\,\mathrm{d}t+F(X(t))\,\mathrm{d}t+Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\,\mathrm{d}W(t),\quad t\in(0,T],\\ X(0)=X_0\in H,\end{cases}\tag{3.1}
$$

where $T\in(0,\infty)$, $\{W(t)\}_{t\in[0,T]}$ is a cylindrical I_H-Wiener process on a given stochastic basis $\big(\Omega,\mathcal{F},\mathbb{P},\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\in[0,T]}\big)$. In the above setting, the dominant linear operator A generates an analytic semigroup $E(t)=e^{tA}$, $t\in[0,\infty)$ in H and there exists an increasing sequence of real numbers $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ and an orthonormal basis $\{e_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ of H such that $Ae_i=-\lambda_i e_i$ with $0<\lambda_1\le\lambda_2\le\cdots\le\lambda_n(\to\infty)$. This allows us to define fractional powers of $-A$, i.e., $(-A)^\gamma,\gamma\in\mathbb{R}$, in a much simple way, see [22, Appendix B.2]. Moreover,

$$
\begin{aligned}\|(-A)^\gamma E(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(H)}\le&Ct^{-\gamma},\quad t>0,\gamma\ge0,\\ \|(-A)^{-\rho}(I-E(t))\|_{\mathcal{L}(H)}\le&Ct^{\rho},\quad t>0,\rho\in[0,1].\end{aligned}\tag{3.2}
$$

Here and below, C is a generic constant that may vary from one place to another. Now we introduce the Hilbert space $\dot{H}^\gamma = \mathcal{D}((-A)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}})$ for $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, equipped with the inner product $\langle \varphi, \psi \rangle_{\dot{H}^\gamma} := \big\langle (-A)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}\varphi, (-A)^{\frac{\gamma}{2}}\psi \big\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^\infty \lambda_i^\gamma \langle \varphi, e_i\rangle\langle \psi, e_i\rangle$ and the corresponding norm $\|\varphi\|_\gamma = \sqrt{\langle \varphi, \varphi\rangle_{\dot{H}^\gamma}}$ for $\varphi, \psi \in \dot{H}^\gamma$. To guarantee a unique mild solution of (3.1) and for the purpose of the following weak convergence analysis, we make assumptions as follows.

Assumption 3.1 *Assume the setting in the first paragraph of Section 3 and*

$$\|(-A)^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H)} < \infty, \quad \text{for some } \beta \in (0, 1]. \tag{3.3}$$

Additionally, $F\colon H \to H$ is assumed to be a twice differentiable mapping satisfying

$$\|F(\varphi)\| \leq L(\|\varphi\| + 1), \quad \|F'(\varphi)\psi\| \leq L\|\psi\|, \quad \varphi, \psi \in H, \tag{3.4}$$

$$\|(-A)^{-\eta} F''(\varphi)(\psi_1, \psi_2)\| \leq L\|\psi_1\|\|\psi_2\|, \quad \varphi, \psi_1, \psi_2 \in H, \ \text{for some } \eta \in [0, 1), \tag{3.5}$$

$$\|(-A)^{-\frac{\delta}{2}} F'(\varphi)\psi\| \leq L\big(1 + \|\varphi\|_1\big)\|\psi\|_{-1}, \ \varphi \in \dot{H}^1, \ \psi \in H, \ \text{for some } \delta \in [1, 2). \tag{3.6}$$

Under Assumption 3.1, the problem (3.1) admits a unique mild solution [9, Theorem 5.3.1]. Subsequently we verify this assumption for a concrete semi-linear stochastic heat equation.

Example 3.2 *Let $T \in (0, \infty)$ and let $\mathcal{O} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d = 1, 2, 3$, be a bounded open set with Lipschitz boundary. Consider a semi-linear stochastic heat equation subject to additive noise,*

$$\begin{cases} du = \Delta u\, dt + f(\xi, u)dt + Q^{\frac{1}{2}} dW(t), \quad t \in (0, T], \ \xi \in \mathcal{O}, \\ u(0, \xi) = u_0(\xi), \quad \xi \in \mathcal{O}, \\ u(t, \xi) = 0, \quad \xi \in \partial\mathcal{O}, \ t \in (0, T], \end{cases} \tag{3.7}$$

where $f\colon \mathcal{O} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is assumed to be a smooth nonlinear function satisfying

$$|f(\xi, z)| \leq c_f(|z| + 1), \quad \big|\tfrac{\partial f}{\partial z}(\xi, z)\big| \leq c_f, \quad \big|\tfrac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \xi_i \partial z}(\xi, z)\big| \leq c_f, \quad \text{and} \quad \big|\tfrac{\partial^2 f}{\partial z^2}(\xi, z)\big| \leq c_f \tag{3.8}$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, 2, ..., d$, $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, ..., \xi_d)^T \in \mathcal{O}$. For this example we set $U = H = L^2\big(\mathcal{O}, \mathbb{R}\big)$, the space of real-valued square integrable functions endowed with the usual norm $\|\cdot\|$ and inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. Let $A = \Delta = \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \xi_i^2}$ with $\mathcal{D}(A) = H^2(\mathcal{O}) \cap H_0^1(\mathcal{O})$, and define the Nemytskij operator $F\colon H \to H$ associated to $f\colon \mathcal{O} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ as in (3.7), by

$$F(\varphi)(\xi) = f(\xi, \varphi(\xi)), \ \xi \in \mathcal{O}. \tag{3.9}$$

Then (3.1) can be an abstract formulation of (3.7) and the derivative operators of F are given by

$$F'(\varphi)(\psi)\,(\xi) = \tfrac{\partial f}{\partial z}(\xi, \varphi(\xi))\psi(\xi), \quad \xi \in \mathcal{O}, \tag{3.10}$$

$$F''(\varphi)(\psi_1, \psi_2)\,(\xi) = \tfrac{\partial^2 f}{\partial z^2}(\xi, \varphi(\xi))\psi_1(\xi)\psi_2(\xi), \quad \xi \in \mathcal{O} \tag{3.11}$$

for all $\varphi, \psi, \psi_1, \psi_2 \in H$. At this moment, we start to verify all conditions in Assumption 3.1. The condition (3.3) is a standard one in the literature [1, 2, 20, 21, 29] and hence we only

validate the remaining three conditions. Thanks to (3.8)*, one can easily check that* (3.4) *is fulfilled. With the aid of the self-adjointness of* $(-A)^\gamma, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ *and Hölder's inequality, we validate* (3.5) *as follows:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(-A)^{-\eta}F''(\varphi)(\psi_1,\psi_2)\| &= \sup_{\|\psi\|\le 1}\big|\big\langle (-A)^{-\eta}F''(\varphi)(\psi_1,\psi_2),\psi\big\rangle\big| \\
&= \sup_{\|\psi\|\le 1}\big|\big\langle F''(\varphi)(\psi_1,\psi_2),(-A)^{-\eta}\psi\big\rangle\big| \\
&\le \big\|F''(\varphi)(\psi_1,\psi_2)\big\|_{L^1(\mathcal{O},\mathbb{R})}\times \sup_{\|\psi\|\le 1}\|(-A)^{-\eta}\psi\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{O},\mathbb{R})} \qquad (3.12)\\
&\le c_f\|\psi_1\|\cdot\|\psi_2\|\cdot C\sup_{\|\psi\|\le 1}\|\psi\| \\
&\le C\|\psi_1\|\cdot\|\psi_2\|,
\end{aligned}$$

where we also used a Sobolev inequality: $\dot{H}^{2\eta}$ *is continuously embedded into* $L^\infty(\mathcal{O},\mathbb{R})$ *for* $\eta > \frac{d}{4}, d = 1,2,3$*. To verify* (3.6)*, we first recall that* $\|\psi\|_1 = \|\nabla\psi\|$ *for* $\psi \in \dot{H}^1$ *(see, e.g., [26, Lemma 3.1] for details). This together with conditions in* (3.8) *yields that, for* $\varphi \in \dot{H}^1$*,* $\phi \in \dot{H}^\delta$ *with* $\delta \in [1,2)$ *and* $\delta > \frac{d}{2}, d = 1,2,3$*,*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\nabla F'(\varphi)\phi\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^d\int_{\mathcal{O}}\big|\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\xi_i}\big(\tfrac{\partial f}{\partial z}(\xi,\varphi(\xi))\phi(\xi)\big)\big|^2 d\xi \\
\le& 3\sum_{i=1}^d\bigg[\int_{\mathcal{O}}\big|\tfrac{\partial^2 f}{\partial\xi_i\partial z}(\xi,\varphi(\xi))\phi(\xi)\big|^2 + \big|\tfrac{\partial^2 f}{\partial z^2}(\xi,\varphi(\xi))\tfrac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\xi_i}(\xi)\phi(\xi)\big|^2 + \big|\tfrac{\partial f}{\partial z}(\xi,\varphi(\xi))\tfrac{\partial\phi}{\partial\xi_i}(\xi)\big|^2 d\xi\bigg] \\
\le& 3dc_f^2\|\phi\|^2 + 3c_f^2\sup_{\xi\in\mathcal{O}}|\phi(\xi)|^2\sum_{i=1}^d\int_{\mathcal{O}}\big|\tfrac{\partial\varphi}{\partial\xi_i}(\xi)\big|^2 d\xi + 3c_f^2\sum_{i=1}^d\int_{\mathcal{O}}\big|\tfrac{\partial\phi}{\partial\xi_i}(\xi)\big|^2 d\xi \\
=& 3dc_f^2\|\phi\|^2 + 3c_f^2\|\phi\|^2_{C(\mathcal{O},\mathbb{R})}\cdot\|\nabla\varphi\|^2 + 3c_f^2\|\nabla\phi\|^2 \\
=& 3dc_f^2\|\phi\|^2 + 3c_f^2\|\phi\|^2_{C(\mathcal{O},\mathbb{R})}\cdot\|\varphi\|_1^2 + 3c_f^2\|\phi\|_1^2 \\
\le& C\big(\|\varphi\|_1^2+1\big)\|\phi\|_\delta^2, \qquad (3.13)
\end{aligned}$$

where at the last step the facts were used that $\dot{H}^\delta \subset C(\mathcal{O},\mathbb{R})$ *continuously for* $\delta > \frac{d}{2}$ *by the Sobolev embedding theorem and* $\dot{H}^\alpha \subset \dot{H}^\beta$ *for* $\alpha \ge \beta$*. Due to* (3.4) *and* (3.13)*, one can again use [26, Lemma 3.1] to show that* $F'(\varphi)\phi \in \dot{H}^1$ *and thus*

$$\big\|F'(\varphi)\phi\big\|_1 = \|\nabla F'(\varphi)\phi\| \le C\big(\|\varphi\|_1+1\big)\|\phi\|_\delta \qquad (3.14)$$

holds for $\varphi \in \dot{H}^1$*,* $\phi \in \dot{H}^\delta$ *with* $\delta \in [1,2)$ *and* $\delta > \frac{d}{2}$*,* $d = 1,2,3$*. To see* (3.6)*, we note that*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(-A)^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}F'(\varphi)\psi\| &= \sup_{\|\xi\|\le 1}\big|\big\langle(-A)^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}F'(\varphi)\psi,\xi\big\rangle\big| = \sup_{\|\xi\|\le 1}\big|\big\langle\psi,\big(F'(\varphi)\big)^*(-A)^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}\xi\big\rangle\big| \\
&= \sup_{\|\xi\|\le 1}\big|\big\langle(-A)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\psi,(-A)^{\frac{1}{2}}F'(\varphi)(-A)^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}\xi\big\rangle\big| \qquad (3.15)\\
&\le \|\psi\|_{-1}\sup_{\|\xi\|\le 1}\|F'(\varphi)(-A)^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}\xi\|_1 \\
&\le C\big(\|\varphi\|_1+1\big)\|\psi\|_{-1},
\end{aligned}$$

where the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the self-adjointness of $F'(\varphi)$ and $(-A)^\gamma$ were used.

3.1 Pure time discretization

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define a finite dimensional subspace H_n of H by $H_n := \operatorname{span}\{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_n\}$ and a projection $P_n : H \to H_n$ by $P_n v = \sum_{i=1}^n \langle e_i, v\rangle e_i$, $v \in H$. Then we introduce a Galerkin approximation to (3.1) in the finite dimensional space H_n,

$$\begin{cases} \mathrm{d}X^n(t) = A_n X^n(t)\mathrm{d}t + P_n F(X^n(t))\mathrm{d}t + P_n Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\,\mathrm{d}W(t), \quad t \in (0,T], \\ X^n(0) = X_0^N := P_n X_0 \in H_n, \end{cases} \tag{3.16}$$

where $A_n \colon H_n \to H_n$ is defined by $A_n = AP_n$, and generates a strongly continuous semigroup $E_n(t) = e^{tA_n}$, $t \in [0,\infty)$ in H_n. Similarly as above, we can define $(-A_n)^\gamma \colon H_n \to H_n$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ as $(-A_n)^\gamma \xi := \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i^\gamma \langle \xi, e_i\rangle e_i$, $\xi \in H_n$. Note that $(-A_n)^\gamma P_n\varphi = (-A)^\gamma P_n\varphi$ and $E_n(t)P_n\varphi = E(t)P_n\varphi$ hold for $\varphi \in H$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. Further, one can easily check that under Assumption 3.1, all conditions in Assumption 2.1 with $F_n = P_nF$ and $B_n = P_nQ^{\frac{1}{2}}$ are fulfilled. Therefore the obtained error representation formula (2.2) is valid in the setting of this section. Moreover, variants of conditions in (3.2) and Assumption 3.1 remain true and is frequently used in the following estimates. For example, we have

$$\|(-A_n)^\gamma E_n(t)\|_{\mathcal{L}(H_n)} \le Ct^{-\gamma}, \gamma \ge 0,\ \|(-A_n)^{-\rho}(I - E_n(t))\|_{\mathcal{L}(H_n)} \le Ct^\rho,\ \rho \in [0,1], \tag{3.17}$$

$$\|(-A_n)^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} P_n Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H,H_n)} < \infty,\ \beta \in (0,1], \tag{3.18}$$

$$\|(-A_n)^{-\eta} P_n F''(\varphi)(\psi_1,\psi_2)\| \le L\|\psi_1\|\|\psi_2\|,\ \varphi,\psi_1,\psi_2 \in H_n, \eta \in [0,1), \tag{3.19}$$

where the constants are independent of n. Recall that such spectral Galerkin approximation was also used in [12, 29] to handle the weak error analysis. Repeating each lines in the proof of [29, Lemma 3.1,3.2,3.3] and taking the condition (3.19) and the condition $X_0 \in \dot{H}^\beta$ into account, we have the following regularity results.

Lemma 3.3 *Let Assumption 3.1 hold and let $\mu^n(t,x)$ be defined by (2.5) with $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}_b^2(H;\mathbb{R})$. Then for $\gamma \in [0,1), \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in [0,1)$ satisfying $\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 < 1$ there exist constants c_γ and c_{γ_1,γ_2} such that*

$$\|(-A_n)^\gamma D\mu^n(t,x)\| \le c_\gamma\, t^{-\gamma}, \tag{3.20}$$

$$\|(-A_n)^{\gamma_2} D^2\mu^n(t,x)(-A_n)^{\gamma_1}\|_{\mathcal{L}(H_n)} \le c_{\gamma_1,\gamma_2}\left(t^{-(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)} + 1\right). \tag{3.21}$$

Lemma 3.4 *Let Assumption 3.1 hold and let $X_0 \in \dot{H}^\beta$. Then for $\gamma \in [0, \frac{\beta}{2})$ and arbitrarily small $\epsilon > 0$ we have*

$$\sup_{0\le m\le M} \|(-A_n)^\gamma Y_m^n\|_{L^2(\Omega,H_n)} \le C \quad \textit{and} \quad \|\tilde{Y}^n(t) - Y_m^n\|_{L^2(\Omega,H_n)} \le C\tau^{\frac{\beta-\epsilon}{2}}, \tag{3.22}$$

where Y_m^n is produced by (2.4) and $\tilde{Y}^n(t)$ is given by (2.8).

Furthermore, we can show the following result.

Lemma 3.5 *Let Assumption 3.1 hold and let $X_0 \in \dot{H}^1$. Then for arbitrarily small $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$\|(-A_n)^{\frac{1}{2}} Y_m^n\|_{L^2(\Omega,H_n)} \leq C\big(1+\tau^{\frac{\beta-1-\epsilon}{2}}\big) \tag{3.23}$$

holds for $\beta \in (0,1]$ and $m = 0, 1, \cdots, M$.

Proof of Lemma 3.5. Equation (2.4) implies for $m = 0, 1, ..., M$ that

$$Y_m^n = E_n(t_m)X_0^n + \tau \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} E_n(t_m - t_k)F_n(Y_k^n) + \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} E_n(t_m - t_k)P_n Q^{\frac{1}{2}} \Delta W_k.$$

Therefore using Itô's isometry and the stability of $E_n(t)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\|(-A_n)^{\frac{1}{2}} Y_m^n\|_{L^2(\Omega,H_n)} \leq & \|(-A_n)^{\frac{1}{2}} E_n(t_m)X_0^n\| \\
& + \tau \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \|(-A_n)^{\frac{1}{2}} E_n(t_m - t_k)F_n(Y_k^n)\|_{L^2(\Omega,H_n)} \\
& + \Big(\tau \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \|(-A_n)^{\frac{1}{2}} E_n(t_m - t_k)P_n Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2_{\mathcal{L}_2(H,H_n)}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
\leq & \|X_0\|_1 + I_1 + I_2.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

Using (3.17), (3.4) and (3.22) shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 \leq & C\tau \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} (t_m - t_k)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|F_n(Y_k^n)\|_{L^2(\Omega,H_n)} \\
\leq & CL\tau \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} (t_m - t_k)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \big(\|Y_k^n\|_{L^2(\Omega,H_n)} + 1\big) < \infty.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

Further, (3.17) and (3.18) together give

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_2|^2 \leq & \tau \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \|(-A_n)^{\frac{2-\beta}{2}} E_n(t_m - t_k)\|^2_{\mathcal{L}(H_n)} \cdot \|(-A_n)^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} P_n Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\|^2_{\mathcal{L}_2(H,H_n)} \\
\leq & C\tau \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} (t_m - t_k)^{-2+\beta} \leq CT^{\epsilon} \cdot \tau \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} (t_m - t_k)^{-2+\beta-\epsilon} \\
\leq & CT^{\epsilon}\tau^{\beta-1-\epsilon} \sum_{k=1}^{m} k^{-2+\beta-\epsilon} \leq C\tau^{\beta-1-\epsilon}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

Putting them together thus shows the desired assertion. □

Armed with the above preparations, we can prove the following result.

Theorem 3.6 *Let Assumption 3.1 hold and let $X_0 \in \dot{H}^1$, $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}_b^2(H;\mathbb{R})$. Then for arbitrarily small $\epsilon > 0$ it holds that*

$$\left|\mathbb{E}\big[\Phi(Y_M^n)\big] - \mathbb{E}[\Phi(X^n(T))]\right| \leq C\tau^{\beta-\epsilon}, \tag{3.27}$$

where the constant C depends on $\beta, \eta, \delta, \epsilon, T, L$ and X_0, but is independent of n and M.

The proof of this result will be postponed. As an immediate consequence we have

Corollary 3.7 *Assume that all conditions in Theorem 3.6 are fulfilled. Then it holds that, for arbitrarily small $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$\left|\mathbb{E}\big[\Phi(Y_M)\big] - \mathbb{E}[\Phi(X(T))]\right| \leq C\tau^{\beta-\epsilon}. \tag{3.28}$$

Proof of Corollary 3.7 Similarly to [29, Appendix], one can rigorously prove that $X^n(T)$ and Y_M^n, respectively, mean-square converge to $X(T)$ and Y_M. Since the estimate (3.27) is uniform with respect to n and $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}_b^2(H;\mathbb{R})$, letting $n \to \infty$ yields the assertion. □

Proof of Theorem 3.6. According to (2.7), we have the following error representation

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\Phi(Y_M^n)\big] - \mathbb{E}[\Phi(X^n(T))] = \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} \big(b_m^1 + b_m^2\big), \tag{3.29}$$

where we introduce further decomposition of b_m^1 and b_m^2 as

$$\begin{aligned} b_m^1 =& \int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big\langle D\mu^n(T-t,\tilde{Y}^n(t)), \big(E_n(t-t_m)-I\big)F_n(Y_m^n)\Big\rangle\Big]\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &+ \int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big\langle D\mu^n(T-t,\tilde{Y}^n(t)), F_n(Y_m^n) - F_n\big(\tilde{Y}^n(t)\big)\Big\rangle\Big]\,\mathrm{d}t \\ =& b_m^{1,1} + b_m^{1,2}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.30}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} b_m^2 =& \tfrac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \mathrm{Tr}\Big\{D^2\mu^n(T-t,\tilde{Y}^n(t))\,E_n(t-t_m)P_nQ^{\frac{1}{2}}\big((E_n(t-t_m)-I)P_nQ^{\frac{1}{2}}\big)^*\Big\}\mathrm{d}t \\ &+ \tfrac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \mathrm{Tr}\Big\{D^2\mu^n(T-t,\tilde{Y}^n(t))\,(E_n(t-t_m)-I)P_nQ^{\frac{1}{2}}\big(P_nQ^{\frac{1}{2}}\big)^*\Big\}\mathrm{d}t \\ =& b_m^{2,1} + b_m^{2,2}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

Next, we estimate b_m^1 and b_m^2 separately. Combining (3.4), (3.17), (3.20) and (3.22) yields

$$\begin{aligned} |b_m^{1,1}| \leq& c_{1-\epsilon}\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \mathbb{E}\big[\big\|A_n^{-1+\epsilon}\big(E_n(t-t_m)-I\big)F_n(Y_m^n)\big\|\big](T-t)^{-1+\epsilon}\,\mathrm{d}t \\ \leq& C\tau^{1-\epsilon}\mathbb{E}[\|F_n(Y_m^n)\|]\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}}(T-t)^{-1+\epsilon}\,\mathrm{d}t \leq C\tau^{1-\epsilon}\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}}(T-t)^{-1+\epsilon}\,\mathrm{d}t. \end{aligned} \tag{3.32}$$

Thanks to (3.4), (3.21) and (3.22), we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
|b_m^{1,2}| \leq & \Big| \int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big\langle D\mu^n(T-t,\tilde{Y}^n(t)) - D\mu^n(T-t,Y_m^n), F_n\big(\tilde{Y}^n(t)\big) - F_n(Y_m^n)\Big\rangle\Big]\mathrm{d}t\Big| \\
& + \Big| \int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big\langle D\mu^n(T-t,Y_m^n), F_n(\tilde{Y}^n(t)) - F_n(Y_m^n)\Big\rangle\Big]\mathrm{d}t\Big| \\
\leq & C\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \mathbb{E}\big[\big\|\tilde{Y}^n(t) - Y_m^n\big\|^2\big]\mathrm{d}t + J_m \leq C\tau^{1+\beta-\epsilon} + J_m,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.33}
$$

where we denote

$$
J_m := \Big| \int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big\langle D\mu^n(T-t,Y_m^n), F_n\big(\tilde{Y}^n(t)\big) - F_n(Y_m^n)\Big\rangle\Big]\mathrm{d}t\Big|. \tag{3.34}
$$

To estimate J_m properly, we use a linearization step to decompose J_m as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
J_m \leq & \Big| \int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big\langle D\mu^n(T-t,Y_m^n), P_nF'(Y_m^n)\big(\tilde{Y}^n(t) - Y_m^n\big)\Big\rangle\Big]\mathrm{d}t\Big| \\
& + \Big| \int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big\langle D\mu^n(T-t,Y_m^n), \int_0^1 P_nF''\big(\chi(r)\big)\big(\tilde{Y}^n(t) - Y_m^n, \tilde{Y}^n(t) - Y_m^n\big)(1-r)\mathrm{d}r\Big\rangle\Big]\mathrm{d}t\Big| \\
:= & J_m^1 + J_m^2,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.35}
$$

where for short we write $\chi(r) := Y_m^n + r(\tilde{Y}^n(t) - Y_m^n)$. Concerning J_m^2, one can use (3.20), (3.19) and (3.22) to show that

$$
\begin{aligned}
J_m^2 \leq & c_\eta \int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}\big[\big\|(-A_n)^{-\eta}P_nF''\big(\chi(r)\big)\big(\tilde{Y}^n(t) - Y_m^n, \tilde{Y}^n(t) - Y_m^n\big)\big\|\big](T-t)^{-\eta}\,\mathrm{d}r\,\mathrm{d}t \\
\leq & Lc_\eta \int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}\big[\big\|\tilde{Y}^n(t) - Y_m^n\big\|^2\big](T-t)^{-\eta}\,\mathrm{d}r\,\mathrm{d}t \\
\leq & C\tau^{\beta-\epsilon} \int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} (T-t)^{-\eta}\mathrm{d}t.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.36}
$$

We are now in a position to estimate J_m^1. Recall that

$$
\tilde{Y}^n(t) - Y_m^n = \big(E_n(t-t_m) - I\big)Y_m^n + E_n(t-t_m)\big[F_n(Y_m^n)(t-t_m) + B_n(W(t) - W(t_m))\big]. \tag{3.37}
$$

This together with (3.6), (3.17), (3.20), (3.22), (3.23) and Hölder's inequality implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
J_m^1 =& \Big| \int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big\langle D\mu^n(T-t, Y_m^n), P_n F'(Y_m^n)\big(E_n(t-t_m)-I\big)Y_m^n\Big\rangle\Big]\mathrm{d}t\Big| \\
&+ \Big| \int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \mathbb{E}\Big[\Big\langle D\mu^n(T-t, Y_m^n), P_n F'(Y_m^n)E_n(t-t_m)F_n(Y_m^n)(t-t_m)\Big\rangle\Big]\mathrm{d}t\Big| \\
\leq& c_{\delta/2}\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \mathbb{E}\big[\big\|(-A_n)^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}P_n F'(Y_m^n)\big(E_n(t-t_m)-I\big)Y_m^n\big\|\big](T-t)^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}\,\mathrm{d}t \\
&+ c_0 L\tau^2\,\mathbb{E}\big[\|F_n(Y_m^n)\|\big] \\
\leq& C\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \mathbb{E}\Big[\big(1+\|Y_m^n\|_1\big)\big\|\big(E_n(t-t_m)-I\big)Y_m^n\big\|_{-1}\Big](T-t)^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}\mathrm{d}t + C\tau^2 \\
\leq& C\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \big(1+\|Y_m^n\|_{L^2(\Omega,\dot{H}^1)}\big)\big\|\big(E_n(t-t_m)-I\big)Y_m^n\big\|_{L^2(\Omega,\dot{H}^{-1})}(T-t)^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}\mathrm{d}t + C\tau^2 \\
\leq& C\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \big(1+\tau^{\frac{\beta-1-\epsilon}{2}}\big)\big\|(-A_n)^{-\frac{1+\beta-\epsilon}{2}}\big(E_n(t-t_m)-I\big)\big\|_{\mathcal{L}(H_n)}(T-t)^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}\mathrm{d}t + C\tau^2 \\
\leq& C\tau^{\beta-\epsilon}\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} (T-t)^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}\mathrm{d}t + C\tau^2. \qquad (3.38)
\end{aligned}$$

In the above estimates, the term containing the stochastic increment vanishes by the independence of the numerical solution Y_m^n and the stochastic increment $E_n(t-t_m)B_n(W(t)-W(t_m))$. Plugging (3.38) and (3.36) into (3.34), we derive from (3.33) that

$$|b_m^{1,2}| \leq C\tau^{1+\beta-\epsilon} + C\tau^{\beta-\epsilon}\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} (T-t)^{-\eta}\mathrm{d}t + C\tau^{\beta-\epsilon}\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} (T-t)^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}\mathrm{d}t \qquad (3.39)$$

for arbitrarily small $\epsilon > 0$. A combination of this and (3.32) implies

$$|b_m^1| \leq C\tau^{1+\beta-\epsilon} + C\tau^{\beta-\epsilon}\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} (T-t)^{-\eta} + (T-t)^{-\frac{\delta}{2}}\mathrm{d}t + C\tau^{1-\epsilon}\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} (T-t)^{-1+\epsilon}\,\mathrm{d}t. \qquad (3.40)$$

Now it remains to treat the estimate of b_m^2. Using (3.18) and (3.21) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
|b_m^{2,1}| =& \tfrac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \mathrm{Tr}\Big\{(-A_n)^{\frac{\beta+1}{2}-\epsilon} D^2\mu^n(T-t,\tilde{Y}^n(t))\, E_n(t-t_m)P_nQ^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\qquad \cdot \big((-A_n)^{-\frac{\beta+1}{2}+\epsilon}(E_n(t-t_m)-I)P_nQ^{\frac{1}{2}}\big)^*\Big\}\mathrm{d}t \\
\leq& C\mathbb{E}\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \big\|(-A_n)^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} E_n(t-t_m)P_nQ^{\frac{1}{2}}\big((-A_n)^{-\frac{\beta+1}{2}+\epsilon}(E_n(t-t_m)-I)P_nQ^{\frac{1}{2}}\big)^*\big\|_{\mathcal{L}_1(H_n)} \\
&\qquad \times \big[(T-t)^{-1+\epsilon}+1\big]\mathrm{d}t \\
\leq& C\mathbb{E}\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \big\|(-A_n)^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} E_n(t-t_m)P_nQ^{\frac{1}{2}}\big\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H,H_n)} \\
&\qquad \times \big\|\big((-A_n)^{-\frac{\beta+1}{2}+\epsilon}(E_n(t-t_m)-I)P_nQ^{\frac{1}{2}}\big)^*\big\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H_n,H)}\big[(T-t)^{-1+\epsilon}+1\big]\mathrm{d}t \\
\leq& C\mathbb{E}\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}} \big\|(-A_n)^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} P_nQ^{\frac{1}{2}}\big\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H,H_n)} \\
&\qquad \times \big\|(-A_n)^{-\beta+\epsilon}(E_n(t-t_m)-I)(-A_n)^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}}P_nQ^{\frac{1}{2}}\big\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(H,H_n)}\big[(T-t)^{-1+\epsilon}+1\big]\mathrm{d}t \\
\leq& C\tau^{\beta-\epsilon}\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}}(T-t)^{-1+\epsilon}\mathrm{d}t + C\tau^{1+\beta-\epsilon}. \qquad (3.41)
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can arrive at

$$|b_m^{2,2}| \leq C\tau^{\beta-\epsilon}\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}}(T-t)^{-1+\epsilon}\mathrm{d}t + C\tau^{1+\beta-\epsilon}. \qquad (3.42)$$

Consequently,

$$|b_m^{2}| \leq |b_m^{2,1}| + |b_m^{2,2}| \leq C\tau^{\beta-\epsilon}\int_{t_m}^{t_{m+1}}(T-t)^{-1+\epsilon}\mathrm{d}t + C\tau^{1+\beta-\epsilon}. \qquad (3.43)$$

Inserting (3.40) and (3.43) into (3.29) gives the desired assertion (3.27). □

3.2 Full discretizations

In this subsection, we endeavor to examine weak error estimates of full discretizations. We restrict ourselves to the spectral Galerkin spatial discretization [16, 17, 19, 28] and give some comments on the weak convergence rate of the finite element spatial discretization. The main convergence result of this subsection reads as follows.

Theorem 3.8 *Let Assumption 3.1 hold and let $X_0 \in \dot{H}^{\max(2\beta,1)}$ and $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}_b^2(H;\mathbb{R})$. Let Y_M^N be a full discretization defined by* (3.16) *and let $X(T)$ be the mild solution of* (3.1)*. Then for arbitrarily small $\epsilon > 0$ it holds that*

$$\big|\mathbb{E}\big[\Phi(Y_M^N)\big] - \mathbb{E}\big[\Phi(X(T))\big]\big| \leq C\big(\tau^{\beta-\epsilon} + (\lambda_N)^{-\beta+\epsilon}\big), \qquad (3.44)$$

where the constant C depends on $\beta, \eta, \delta, \epsilon, T, L$ and X_0, but is independent of M and N.

Proof of Theorem 3.8. We take $K \in \mathbb{N} \cap [N, \infty)$ and decompose the overall approximation error as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\big|\mathbb{E}[\Phi(Y_M^N)] - \mathbb{E}[\Phi(X(T))]\big| \leq & \big|\mathbb{E}[\Phi(Y_M^N)] - \mathbb{E}[\Phi(X^N(T))]\big| \\ & + \big|\mathbb{E}[\Phi(X^N(T))] - \mathbb{E}[\Phi(X^K(T))]\big| \\ & + \big|\mathbb{E}[\Phi(X^K(T))] - \mathbb{E}[\Phi(X(T))]\big|.\end{aligned} \tag{3.45}$$

Taking $K \to \infty$ in (3.45) and using the error estimate in Theorem 3.6 together with the fact that $X^K(t)$ converges to $X(T)$ in mean-square sense we get

$$\big|\mathbb{E}[\Phi(Y_M^N)] - \mathbb{E}[\Phi(X(T))]\big| \leq C\tau^{\beta-\epsilon} + \limsup_{K\to\infty} \big|\mathbb{E}[\Phi(X^N(T))] - \mathbb{E}[\Phi(X^K(T))]\big|. \tag{3.46}$$

It remains to estimate the second term of the right-hand side of (3.46). Adopting the above notation leads us to

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}[\Phi(X^N(T))] - \mathbb{E}[\Phi(X^K(T))] = \mathbb{E}[\mu^K(0, X^N(T))] - \mathbb{E}[\mu^K(T, X_0^K)] \\ &\quad = \mathbb{E}[\mu^K(0, X^N(T))] - \mathbb{E}[\mu^K(T, X_0^N)] + \mathbb{E}[\mu^K(T, X_0^N)] - \mathbb{E}[\mu^K(T, X_0^K)].\end{aligned} \tag{3.47}$$

Owing to (3.20) and the error estimate $\|(P_N - P_K)x\| \leq (\lambda_N)^{-\gamma}\|x\|_{2\gamma}$, we have

$$\big|\mathbb{E}[\mu^K(T, X_0^N)] - \mathbb{E}[\mu^K(T, X_0^K)]\big| \leq C\|X_0^N - X_0^K\| = C\|(P_N - P_K)X_0\| \leq C\|X_0\|_{2\beta}(\lambda_N)^{-\beta}. \tag{3.48}$$

Further, using (2.6) and the Itô formula together yields

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}[\mu^K(0, X^N(T))] - \mathbb{E}[\mu^K(T, X_0^N)] \\ &\quad = \mathbb{E}\int_0^T -\tfrac{\partial \mu^K}{\partial t}(T-t, X^N(t))\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &\qquad + \mathbb{E}\int_0^T \Big\langle A_N X^N(t) + F_N(X^N(t)), D\mu^K(T-t, X^N(t))\Big\rangle\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &\qquad + \tfrac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\int_0^T \mathrm{Tr}\Big\{D^2\mu^K(T-t, X^N(t))B_N\big(B_N\big)^*\Big\}\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &\quad = \mathbb{E}\int_0^T \Big\langle F_N(X^N(t)) - F_K(X^N(t)), D\mu^K(T-t, X^N(t))\Big\rangle\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &\qquad + \tfrac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\int_0^T \mathrm{Tr}\Big\{D^2\mu^K(T-t, X^N(t))\Big(B_N\big(B_N\big)^* - B_K\big(B_K\big)^*\Big)\Big\}\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &\quad := J_1 + J_2,\end{aligned} \tag{3.49}$$

where we also used the fact that $A_N X^N(t) - A_K X^N(t) = 0$ for $K \in \mathbb{N} \cap [N, \infty)$. In what follows we bound J_1 and J_2 separately. For J_1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|J_1| \leq & C\int_0^T (T-t)^{-1+\epsilon}\mathbb{E}\big[\|(-A_K)^{-1+\epsilon}(P_N - P_K)F(X^N(t))\|\big]\,\mathrm{d}t \\ & \leq C(\lambda_N)^{-1+\epsilon}\int_0^T (T-t)^{-1+\epsilon}\mathbb{E}\big[\|F(X^N(t))\|\big]\,\mathrm{d}t \leq C(\lambda_N)^{-1+\epsilon}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.50}$$

Concerning the estimate of J_2, we need further decomposition:

$$\begin{aligned} J_2 =& \tfrac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\int_0^T \mathrm{Tr}\Big\{ D^2\mu^K(T-t, X^N(t))\big(P_N - P_K\big)Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\big(P_N Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\big)^*\Big\}\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &+ \tfrac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}\int_0^T \mathrm{Tr}\Big\{ D^2\mu^K(T-t, X^N(t))P_K Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\big((P_N - P_K)Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\big)^*\Big\}\,\mathrm{d}t \\ :=& J_{21} + J_{22}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.51}$$

Standard arguments as above enable us to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} |J_{21}| &= \tfrac{1}{2}\Big|\mathbb{E}\int_0^T \mathrm{Tr}\Big\{(-A_K)^{\frac{1-\beta}{2}} D^2\mu^K(T-t, X^N(t))\big(P_N - P_K\big)Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\big((-A_K)^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} P_N Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\big)^*\Big\}\,\mathrm{d}t\Big| \\ &\le \int_0^T C\big[(T-t)^{-1+\epsilon}+1\big]\Big\|(-A_K)^{-\frac{\beta+1}{2}+\epsilon}\big(P_N - P_K\big)Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\big((-A_K)^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} P_N Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\big)^*\Big\|_{\mathcal{L}_1(H_K)}\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &\le C\int_0^T \big[(T-t)^{-1+\epsilon}+1\big]\Big\|(-A_K)^{-\frac{\beta+1}{2}+\epsilon}\big(P_N - P_K\big)(-A_K)^{\frac{1-\beta}{2}}\Big\|_{\mathcal{L}(H_K)} \\ &\qquad \times \Big\|(-A_K)^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} P_N Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\big((-A_K)^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} P_N Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\big)^*\Big\|_{\mathcal{L}_1(H_K)}\,\mathrm{d}t \\ &\le C\big\|(-A_K)^{-\beta+\epsilon}\big(P_N - P_K\big)\big\|_{\mathcal{L}(H_K)}\big\|(-A_K)^{\frac{\beta-1}{2}} P_N Q^{\frac{1}{2}}\big\|^2_{\mathcal{L}_2(H,H_K)} \\ &\le C(\lambda_N)^{-\beta+\epsilon}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.52}$$

Similarly, one can get

$$|J_{22}| \le C(\lambda_N)^{-\beta+\epsilon}. \tag{3.53}$$

Putting the above estimates together we derive from (3.47) that

$$\big|\mathbb{E}[\Phi(X^N(T))] - \mathbb{E}[\Phi(X^K(T))]\big| \le C(\lambda_N)^{-\beta+\epsilon}. \tag{3.54}$$

Since the constant C is independent of K, this and (3.46) finally complete the proof. □

Remark 3.9 *We remark that the weak convergence analysis for the finite element spatial discretization becomes more involved than that for the spectral Galerkin method. As studied in [2], one needs to utilize Malliavin calculus to handle the irregular term containing $(A_n - A_h)X_h(t)$, where A_h is the discrete version of A in the finite element setting and X_h is the finite element solution. Note that the overall weak error can be decomposed as the spatial weak error and the temporal weak error. Accordingly, combining existing weak error estimates for the finite element spatial discretization in [2] with our results regarding the temporal discretization can lead us to a weak convergence result on the resulting full discretization. We do not intend to detail it but leave it to the readers.*

References

[1] A. Andersson, R. Kruse, and S. Larsson. Duality in refined Sobolev-Malliavin spaces and weak approximations of SPDE. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.5893v2*, 2014.

[2] A. Andersson and S. Larsson. Weak convergence for a spatial approximation of the nonlinear stochastic heat equation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.5564v3*, 2013.

[3] R. Anton, D. Cohen, S. Larsson and X. Wang, Full discretisation of semi-linear stochastic wave equations driven by multiplicative noise, preprint *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.00073*, 2015.

[4] X. Bardina, M. Jolis, and L. Quer-Sardanyons. Weak convergence for the stochastic heat equation driven by Gaussian white noise. *Electron. J. Probab*, 15:1267–1295, 2010.

[5] C.-E. Bréhier. Approximation of the invariant measure with an Euler scheme for stochastic PDEs driven by space-time white noise. *Potential Analysis*, 40(1):1–40, 2014.

[6] D. Cohen, S. Larsson, and M. Sigg. A trigonometric method for the linear stochastic wave equation. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 51(1):204–222, 2013.

[7] D. Cohen and M. Sigg. Convergence analysis of trigonometric methods for stiff second-order stochastic differential equations. *Numer. Math.*, 121(1):1–29, 2012.

[8] D. Conus, A. Jentzen, and R. Kurniawan. Weak convergence rates of spectral Galerkin approximations for SPDEs with nonlinear diffusion coefficients. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1408.1108*, 2014.

[9] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. *Ergodicity for infinite dimensional systems*, volume 229. Cambridge University Press, 1996.

[10] Da Prato G., Zabczyk J. *Stochastic equations in infinite dimensions*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992.

[11] de Bouard A., Debussche A. Weak and strong order of convergence of a semi discrete scheme for the stochastic nonlinear Schrodinger equation. *Appl. Math. Opt.*, 54:369–399, 2006.

[12] Debussche A. Weak approximation of stochastic partial differential equations: the nonlinear case. *Math. Comp.*, 80:89–117, 2011.

[13] Debussche A., Printems J. Weak order for the discretization of the stochastic heat equation. *Math. Comp.*, 78:845–863, 2009.

[14] Geissert M., Kovács M., Larsson S. Rate of weak convergence of the finite element method for the stochastic heat equation with additive noise. *BIT*, 49:343–356, 2009.

[15] M. Hochbruck and A. Ostermann. Exponential integrators. *Acta Numerica*, 19:209–286, 2010.

[16] A. Jentzen, P. Kloeden, G. Winkel, et al. Efficient simulation of nonlinear parabolic SPDEs with additive noise. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 21(3):908–950, 2011.

[17] A. Jentzen and P. E. Kloeden. Overcoming the order barrier in the numerical approximation of stochastic partial differential equations with additive space–time noise. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.*, 465(2102):649–667, 2009.

[18] A. Jentzen and R. Kurniawan. Weak convergence rates for Euler-type approximations of semilinear stochastic evolution equations with nonlinear diffusion coefficients. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1501.03539*, 2015.

[19] P. E. Kloeden, G. J. Lord, A. Neuenkirch, and T. Shardlow. The exponential integrator scheme for stochastic partial differential equations: Pathwise error bounds. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 235(5):1245–1260, 2011.

[20] M. Kovács, S. Larsson, and F. Lindgren. Weak convergence of finite element approximations of linear stochastic evolution equations with additive noise. *BIT*, 52(1):85–108, 2012.

[21] M. Kovács, S. Larsson, and F. Lindgren. Weak convergence of finite element approximations of linear stochastic evolution equations with additive noise II. fully discrete schemes. *BIT*, 53(2):497–525, 2013.

[22] R. Kruse. *Strong and weak approximation of semilinear stochastic evolution equations*. PhD thesis, Springer, 2012.

[23] F. Lindner and R. L. Schilling. Weak order for the discretization of the stochastic heat equation driven by impulsive noise. *Potential Analysis*, 38(2):345–379, 2013.

[24] G. J. Lord and A. Tambue. Stochastic exponential integrators for the finite element discretization of spdes for multiplicative and additive noise. *IMA J. Numer. Anal.*, 33(2):515–543, 2013.

[25] Shardlow T. Weak convergence of a numerical method for a stochastic heat equation. *BIT Numer. Math.*, 43:179–193, 2003.

[26] V. Thomée. *Galerkin finite element methods for parabolic problems*. Springer-Verlag, 2006.

[27] X. Wang. An exponential integrator scheme for time discretization of nonlinear stochastic wave equation. *J. Sci. Comput.*, 64, 234–263, 2015.

[28] X. Wang and S. Gan. A Runge–Kutta type scheme for nonlinear stochastic partial differential equations with multiplicative trace class noise. *Numer. Algorithms*, 62(2):193–223, 2013.

[29] X. Wang and S. Gan. Weak convergence analysis of the linear implicit Euler method for semilinear stochastic partial differential equations with additive noise. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 398(1):151–169, 2013.